

Following more approaches from residents/petitioners, the documents at Colindale Library were reviewed again and at the resident's request I submit this additional representation to the Inspectors with the following observations:

a)Reference to Site 9 was indeed deleted line by line in the original document.

b)In the MMs dated May 2024 document under MM23 Map 30 it does in fact state 'removal of Site 9 (Colindeep Lane...)'

c)However in the Colindale Growth Area section of the MMs document dated May 2024 within an alphabetical listing, item i) it states: **Improving access between Colindale Park and Rushgrove Park by utilising land between Northern Line and the Silkstream for a new pedestrian and cycle route within a new open space** . This virtually replicates the wording from the Council's original document and demonstrates that the Council's intentions for this site have not changed.

Residents feel betrayed by the Council's duplicitous and disingenuous actions of deleting the proposal as Site 9 only to reintroduce a proposed development of the totally inappropriate cycle and pedestrian pathway in the modifications document. Objections to this are provided in detail in the petition of 2021 already submitted to you and which we consider still remains valid.

Furthermore, we would add that with the sharp increase in anti-social behaviour in this area a secluded pathway crossing a partly protected woodland area will be a magnet for attacks both on pedestrians and cyclists. This would be at the rear of our properties also making us extremely vulnerable.

We add this objection to the already extensive list of concerns in our petition of 2021.

I request that this email is also submitted as a representation to the Inspectors - please confirm.

I would sincerely welcome the Council's comments on the decision to delete Site 9 only to have a similar proposal included in the revised document.

Thank you and regards

Donato Peduzzi

Dear Sir/Madam,

I have just reviewed Barnet's Local Plan (Main Modifications) at my local library as my main interest is in the Colindale Growth Area section with specific reference to Site 9 Colindeep Lane. I was extremely surprised and very dismayed by what I read.

Re the schedule of site proposals, on one specific page in the document entitled 'Table of Proposed Main Modifications – May 2024' under the Colindale Growth Area section my attention was drawn to a number of points:

d) Provision of strategic flood risk infrastructure....

e) Improvements to key junctions and roads, including pedestrian and cycle linkages....

h) Provision of a new pedestrian and cycle route under the Northern line to link Colindale Gardens to Colindeep Lane;

i) Improving access between Colindale Park and Rushgrove Park by utilising land between Northern Line and the Silkstream for a new pedestrian and cycle route within a new open space, ensuring that proposals for access improvements minimise impacts on and provide net gains for biodiversity .

Point i) states 'improving access between Colindale Park and Rushgrove Park...' when in fact there is no access whatsoever. The woodland area is completely self-contained and inaccessible, which is why it is a thriving and protected mini 'nature reserve' with mature trees. These points were raised by The Environmental Agency in their comments.

It was my understanding from the Planning Inspectorate report and at a meeting at Hendon Town Hall in 2022 that Site 9 Colindeep Lane, to which the above matters refer, was cancelled in its entirety from Barnet Council's plan to Central Government. This is confirmed by another document at the library which shows Site 9 with deletions of every line.

The Planning Inspectorate stated: 'The site has been found to be not developable due to constraints arising from the extent and magnitude of flood risk affecting the site and therefore the proposed site allocation is to be deleted from the plan.'

I am therefore totally amazed and shocked to find the same proposal reappearing in the amendment document dated May 2024.

In 2021 a detailed petition was submitted against Site 9 signed by 111 residents who would be directly affected by any development of Site 9. Furthermore the Environmental Agency also strongly opposed any development of this site.

Mr Nick Lynch in his email reply to me of 28/4/22 stated the following:

'Yes, it is our intention to remove these 2 sites from the local plan.'

Why then has Barnet Council, just some 12 months later, resurrected this option? Did our petition and the Environmental Agency's opinion count for nothing when this matter was first raised in 2021?

The petition, which should be on file needs to be considered a live and valid document, in view of the fact that Barnet Council has decided to reinstate Site 9 as a development prospect.

Although in the current modified document I did not find reference to any new builds, as stated in the original version, it is inconceivable that Barnet Council will consider any development of Site 9 without the inclusion of some form of dwellings as a quid pro quo for any flood defence costs or other expenditures. Therefore it is imperative that the petition dated 3/8/2021 remains valid in its entirety in opposition to Barnet Council's May 2024 modification document with respect to Site 9 Colindeep Lane . **Please confirm this will be the case.**

I have already had a number of residents coming to me concerned about this issue.

Therefore, to avoid any doubt, I attach herewith the page of objections from the original petition which you will see remain fully valid. **Please confirm your agreement.**

It is with extreme dismay that I find myself, yet again, having to write to you on a matter that all the residents thought had been resolved. However, be assured that going forward, we will be resolved to oppose any development/destruction of this woodland area.

I look forward to receiving your urgent reply to all the points raised in my email.

Thank you

Donato Peduzzi

PETITION: OBJECTION TO SITE 9 PROPOSAL IN COLINDALE GROWTH AREA

As residents and interested parties, we set down below our objections to the inclusion of Site 9 in any redevelopment project as part of the Colindale Growth Area.

We refer, in particular, to any proposal relating to 'land between Northern Line and the Silkstream' referenced on page 62 of your document and as Site 9 on the diagram of Page 61, as well as page 288 and pages 304 to 306.

Page 62, bullet point 8 states:

'Improving access between Colindale Park and Rushgrove Park by utilising land between Northern Line and the Silkstream for a new pedestrian and cycle route within a new open space'.

Our objections are as follows:

- 1) This area has never been used as a pedestrian or cycle route and therefore does not fall into the category of an 'improvement'. The number of cyclists and the pedestrian traffic using this route would be minimal and therefore an unnecessary use of taxpayers' money.
- 2) Despite references to the conduct of extensive consultations being made with relevant parties, at no time has any direct consultation been made with the residents directly affected by this proposal as to their wishes for the development or otherwise of Site 9. This is a lack of duty of care to the parties concerned.
- 3) The area under consideration has always been designated by the Environment Agency as a flood plain area with the Burnt Oak Brook and the Silkstream running across the woodland area. It has been subject to flooding in the past and development of this area would be detrimental to this natural balance.
- 4) The current woodland is an enclosed natural habitat for a large variety of wildlife, including well established families of foxes and birds such as herons, woodpeckers, jays and sparrowhawks. Many species rely on this woodland and are not found in landscaped parks. It is the only such woodland within Colindale, containing many mature trees and is unique as a people-free natural green-belt habitat. With the extensive building in our area and climate change issues very much a consideration, it is vital that we preserve and protect these small woodland areas which can only enhance the 'Healthy Streets Approach'.
- 5) Moreover, we strongly object to any feasibility study being conducted which in itself would disturb this natural habitat. It should be left alone. The area, just in terms of available land mass is not suitable to accommodate both a redevelopment and maintain all the elements of a secluded natural woodland as is currently the case.
- 6) We consider that there is a gross misrepresentation in the document for which we feel most strongly and we are somewhat dismayed by. Namely, on Page 288 of the document under 'Site No. 9 Colindeep Lane (adjacent to Northern Line) (Colindale Growth Area)' reference is made to 'Indicative Units 128' with the box heading: 'Non-Residential Uses' being left blank.

This strongly suggests that the woodland area would not just be destroyed for a pedestrian/cycle route with open spaces but in fact for a housing development. There is no mention of this in the main body of the document, namely '4.19 -4.20 Colindale Growth Area'. We are truly dismayed at the Council's disingenuous attempt in disguising the true nature of their intentions to redevelop this small natural green space.

- 7) Any such residential development would meet further objections from the residents which are in addition to those already mentioned in this submission.
- 8) There is no viable exit point directly into Colindale Park at the Sheaveshill Avenue end as highlighted area on Site 9.
- 9) The height of any proposed residential units and their proximity to our properties could amount to an encroachment of our privacy rights. We are mindful of the enclosed and limited land area under consideration which is wedged between the steep embankment of the Northern line rail and the bank of the Silkstream. Therefore, we suspect that the Council would approve high rise blocks, as in the case for all new developments in Colindale and to which we would also object to in the highest terms.
- 10) Any such development of this woodland area would create serious safety issues at the rear of all our dwellings which benefit from the inaccessibility to our properties.
- 11) Any such development would require additional waste water and sewage management which, for these streets, is already at capacity.
- 12) Any development would require street lighting to make this a viable proposal in terms of all year-round usage which would add to the light pollution that we already face.
- 13) Any development of this site would result in additional noise pollution. We benefit from the noise and visual barrier that this woodland provides us with. The disruption of these barriers goes against the Healthy Street policy.

Furthermore two applications to build houses in the proximity of the highlighted area of Site 9 were refused by Barnet Council in 2004 and 2005.

We consider that we have made a strong enough case to preserve this small woodland from redevelopment and that our objections to your proposal should be acknowledged and validated by the removal of Site 9 of the Colindale Growth Area from the Barnet Draft Local Plan document and from any such future documents or approaches to the Council by developers.

This entire small woodland area at the rear of Sheaveshill Avenue and Colindeep Lane up to the perimeter of the rail track should be fully protected as a 'Site of Importance to Nature'.

As residents directly affected by your proposals, we add our signature to this petition in objection to any redevelopment concerning Site 9: